Placebo Response is Driven by UCS Revaluation: Evidence, Neurophysiological Consequences and a Quantitative Model

Luca Puviani[a], Sidita Rama[b]

[a]*Department of Engineering "Enzo Ferrari" , University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Via Vivarelli 10, int.1-41125 Modena , Italy*
[b]*MD at Local Health Unit of Modena, Via S.Giovanni del Cantone 23, 41121 Modena , Italy*

arXiv:1602.00258v1 [q-bio.NC] 31 Jan 2016

Abstract

Despite growing scientific interest in the placebo effect and increasing understanding of neurobiological mechanisms, theoretical modeling of the placebo response remains poorly developed. The most extensively accepted theories are expectation and conditioning, involving both conscious and unconscious information processing. However, it is not completely understood how these mechanisms can shape the placebo response. We focus here on neural processes which can account for key properties of the response to substance intake. It is shown that placebo response can be conceptualized as a reaction of a distributed neural system within the central nervous system. Such a reaction represents an integrated component of the response to open substance administration (or to substance intake) and is updated through "unconditioned stimulus (UCS) revaluation learning". The analysis leads to a theorem, which proves the existence of two distinct quantities coded within the brain, these are the *expected* or *prediction outcome* and the *reactive response*. We show that the reactive response is updated automatically by implicit revaluation lerning, while the expected outcome can also be modulated through conscious information processing. Conceptualizing the response to substance intake in terms of UCS revaluation learning leads to the theoretical formulation of a potential neuropharmacological treatment for increasing unlimitedly the effectiveness of a given drug.

Email address: luca.puviani@unimore.it (Luca Puviani)

Introduction

What is the neural substrate of placebo response? Are there neurons endowed with a special location or specific neurobiological pathways that are necessary or sufficient for placebo response? Recent approaches have attempted to narrow the focus, and a major insight from the recent publications is that there seems not be a single neurobiological or psychobiological mechanism which is able to explain the placebo effect in general. Instead, different mechanisms exist by which placebo (and nocebo) responses originate and exert their actions. Here, we pursue a different approach. Instead of arguing whether a particular neurobiological pathway, mechanisms, or group of neurons contributes to placebo response or not, our strategy is to characterize the kinds of neural processes (at the system-level) that might account for key properties of the more general response to substance intake. With this aim we start analyzing the response to (*open* or *overt*) pharmacological administration. Drug administration is said to be *open* (or *overt*, opposite to *hidden* or *covert*) whenever the administration itself is correctly perceived by a given subject; so that the individual is conscious of the administration act, and, generally speaking, he/she might also be aware of the effects that such a substance will determine on the organism (e.g. see [1, 2]). We emphasize three properties: pharmacological induced response is *integrated* (the response is given by the integral contribution of different components, which are the *active* pharmacological effect, the *reactive* contribution, due to *self-induced* response, which, in turn is governed by UCS revaluation, conditioning and higher cognitive processing, such as beliefs), at the same time it is highly *differentiated* (one can experience any of a huge number of different pharmacologically-induced response). Furthermore, a third property is represented by the fact that the reactive response mimics the active pharmacological effect (we denote this property as *reactive mimicking*). We first consider neurobiological data indicating that neural processes associated with drug administration response are integrated and differentiated, and, finally, that a distributed system (denoted *reactive system*) mimics the active pharmacological response. We then provide mathematical tools describing the above mentioned properties of the pharmacological response; this leads us to formulate theoretical and operational criteria for determining whether the activity of a group of neurons contributes to placebo response and with which intensity. Moreover, the derived model suggests a pharmacological strategy for increase unlimitedly the response to a drug treatment (and hence the drug effectiveness), exploiting the reactive system dynamics which governs the implicit placebo response.

Methods

General Properties of (Overt) Drug Administration-Induced Response

Generally speaking, the effect of a drug administration is due to the integration of different processes and components which, together, exert their effect on a given organism.

Integration - Integration is a property shared by every response induced by substance intake, irrespective of its specific pharmacological target: Each response comprises a single overall effect that cannot be decomposed into independent components. More specifically, drug administration, and generally speaking substance consumption, exerts an overall effect wich is perceived as unique, conveying pharmacological effects, rewarding, expectations, beliefs and prior experiences (e.g., see [3, 1, 4]). A striking demonstration is given by the decreased effectiveness of hidden treatments. In particular, hidden drug administrations eliminate the psychosocial (placebo) component, so that only the pharmacodynamic effect of the treatment (free of any psychological contamination) can be accomplished. More specifically, in the *open versus hidden treatments* paradigm [3, 1, 5, 2] drugs are administered through hidden infusions by machines; such infusions can be administered using computer-controlled infusion pumps that are preprogrammed to deliver drugs at a desidred time. The crucial factor is that the patients do not know that the drug is being injected. The difference between the responses following the administration of the overt and covert therapy is the placebo (psychological) component, even though no placebo has been given [1]. Furthermore, in [3] are reported experimental results which show how the overall response to an analgesic pharmacological treatment is due to the contribution of 1) prior conditioning, 2) expectations and 3) active pharmacological effect; moreover, the three above mentioned contributions are indirectly evaluated through the involvement of different treatment groups in double-blind design, exploiting the open versus hidden paradigm.

Differentiation - While the drug administration response is given by an integral contribution of different components, there are experimental evidences which show how the mammalian brain can finely discriminate between administration (and/or the intake) of different substances. For instance, neurons in rats can discriminate between cocaine and liquid rewards [6, 7], or between cocaine and heroin [8], possibly even better than between natural rewards [9, 10].

At this point it is useful to introduce some definitions. Provided that a given drug administration represents an *unconditioned stimulus* (UCS), an *active response* is defined as the response determined by the active pharmacological effect of the

UCS within the central nervous system (CNS). Moreover, a *reactive response* is defined as any response which is determined by a self-induced reaction within the CNS, without any active pharmacological contribution. For instance, a conditioned response (CR) induced after some pairings of an active pharmacological UCS and a neutral conditioned stimulus (CS) corresponds to a reactive response, since the elicited response is not substained by any pharmacological active effect. For this reason, a reactive response could represent a specific form of placebo. Furthermore, the UCS *implicit learning* is defined as the implicit (or automatic) UCS response (UCR) evaluation and re-valuation (i.e., UCR *inflation* and *devaluation* or *deflation*; e.g., see [11, 12, 13]).

Difference between (pharmacological) conditioning and implicit UCS revaluation. When a neutral CS is paired with an active drug, the associative learning process is called classical conditioning [14], (for instance when a tone is paired with the self administration of cocaine in rats; [15]); furthermore, when a drug response (UCR) is evaluated and revaluated over trials the learning process is represented by UCS revaluation [12]. In other words, from one hand, classical conditioning learning occurs whenever the CS and the UCS corresponds to different discriminable elements, such that the organism can learn the simultaneously (or causal) co-occurrence of both elements (in other words the "association" of two distinct elements is learned) [14]. Instead, on the other hand, in successive trials involving drug administration there is a unique element (i.e. the drug administration itself, which represents the UCS), which determines an UCR which, in turn, could vary during successive administration trials; more specifically, if the dose of a drug (i.e. the UCS active stimulation intensity) changes over successive open administration trials, the organism updates the evaluation of the experienced outcome through UCS revaluation (for instance, in [11, 13, 16] experiments related to UCR revaluation, independently from classical conditioning, are reported; furthermore, a quantitative analysis of UCS revaluation and its relation with classical conditioning are derived in [12]). It is worth noting that, generally speaking, both classical conditioning and UCS revaluation could occur during drug administration, since the context and other cues could be associated as CSs to the drug administration (UCS).

Finally, a generic induced response within the CNS can be represented by the superposition of the activity of different neural populations; more specifically, assuming that the CNS consists of N different neuronal populations, the response, denoted with the vector $\mathbf{y}$, can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i \mathbf{v}_i, \tag{1}$$

where y_i represents the i-th neuronal population activity[1] and $\{\mathbf{v}_i; i = 1,2,...,N\}$ represents a set of versors, being associated with different neuronal populations, which form a complete basis $\mathscr{B}$ for the CNS space. It is worth noting that the different neuronal populations could be interdependent (i.e., $\mathscr{B}$ does not represent an orthonormal basis), and, the CNS is a nonlinear system, so that even small variations of the activity (or the elicitation) of a single response component could lead to a very different outcomes (for instance, a small variation of the mean firing rate of a population, or of the quantity of a given neurotransmitter, can even lead to an opposite behavioral outcome; [17]).

Reactive mimicking. In a growing body of literature it has been reported that pharmacological conditioning (and implicit UCS revaluation) determines reactive responses which mimic the original active pharmacological effects. For instance, experimental results reported in [15] show that an increase in dopamine release in the *ventral striatum*, measured through microdialysis, are observed not only when rats self administer cocaine (UCS), but also when they are solely presented with a tone (CS) that has been previously paired with cocaine administration. Furthermore, in [3] it is shown that pharmacological conditioning, like conditioning with opioids, produces placebo analgesia mediated via opioid receptors, and that, if conditioning is performed with nonopioid drugs, other nonopioid mechanisms are involved, so that conditioning activates the same neuronal populations as the active pharmacological treatment. Similar results and conclusions have been obtained in mice experiments [18]. Moreover, brain imaging data, evidence that placebos can mimic the effect of active drugs and activate the same brain areas; this occurs for placebo-dopamine in Parkinson's disease [19, 20], for placebo-analgesics [3, 21, 18, 22, 23, 24] or antidepressants, and for placebo-caffeine in healthy subjects [25]. It is worth noting that since the active pharmacological response is highly differentiate, the reactive mimicking property leads to the highly differentiation of the *reactive system*. Such a system can be thought as a distributed network within the CNS, which generates reactions (or self-made responses) to relevant stimuli and substances.

The above mentioned properties of pharmacological responding, that are, integration, differentiation and reactive mimicking, can be described from a quantitative perspective; this should lead to the derivation of the laws governing the origin and

[1] In particular, y_i is a real quantity representing the product between the mean number of elicited neurons and their mean firing rates for the i-th neuronal population (with $i = 1,2,...,N$); consequently, y_i takes on a positive (negative) value if the response produces an increase of (a decrease or inhibition of) the activity for the i-th population, and is equal to zero whenever the response does not involve any adjustment for the baseline activity of the population.

the dynamics of the placebo response. To this aim it is also necessary describing the dynamics of the UCS revaluation, that is the implicit UCR evaluation over successive administration trials.

Error-Driven Learning

From a growing body of literature emerges that learning occurs through the computation of specific *error-signals* (or *prediction errors*) (see [26, 27] for a review). Generally speaking, the prediction error is defined as the difference between the response expected from a given stimulation and the response actually perceived by the elicited organism. This definition relies on experimental observations acquired in functional imaging studies [28, 29, 26], or directly measured in dopaminergic circuits (e.g., in the *ventral tegmental area*, VTA) or in other fear-related circuits [30, 31, 32, 33, 10, 27, 34, 35, 36].

Different mathematical models describing classical conditioning learning (e.g., Rescorla-Wagner model [37, 38] or *temporal difference* (TD) *models* [29, 39, 40, 41]), or describing learning in general, such as the probabilistic (Bayesian) "perception" and "action" learning models (i.e., the *predictive coding* (PC) [42, 43] and the *active inference* [44, 45]), assume that coding behavioral responses involves the computation of an error-signal. More specifically, the brain makes predictions in relation to a given stimulus and, on the basis of the experienced outcome, the prediction is updated through the prediction error. If the experienced outcome is greater (lower) than the prediction, the computed error signal is positive (negative) and corrects the new prediction; furthermore, if the experienced response coincides with the expected outcome, the error signal is zero and no prediction updatings take place.

Theoretical Concepts and Quantities

Differentiation. Eq. (1) describes the elicited response within the CNS accounting for all the involved neuronal populations (or response components); however, we can consider one single component to ease the reading. This choice, however, does not entail any loss of generality, since our model can be applied to any component.

Integration. As previously shown, the response to a drug administration can be expressed by three main contributions (each of which might be further decomposed in more detail), these are: 1) the active pharmacological response, denoted x; 2) the reactive (self-induced) response due to implicit UCS revaluation learning and classical conditioning, denoted i_R; 3) the reactive response due to expectations and, generally speaking, to higher cognitive information processing (such as beliefs, social observations and verbal suggestions), denoted γ. Hence, the integration property leads to the following expression for the general elicited neuronal population:

$$y = x + i_R + \gamma. \tag{2}$$

It is important to note that the above described "response decomposition" is only a theoretical abstraction, since, because the integration property, the response is unique and the brain cannot discriminate between the different contributions.

Reactive mimicking. Since the reactive response (i_R) associated with a given substance determined by implicit UCS revaluation or by pharmacological conditioning mimics the active pharmacological effect (x), the reactive response for a given neuronal population can be expressed as:

$$i_R = \alpha \cdot x, \tag{3}$$

where the term α takes on real values and represents the *efficiency* (or the *strength*) of the reactive system for the given neuronal component.

Implicit UCS revaluation. If multiple successive open drug administration trials are considered, provided that no conscious information are available (such as verbal suggestions or beliefs) about the drug effects, it can be assumed that in every trial the expected (or predicted) response coincides with the last experienced outcome (wich, in turn, coincides with the response experienced in the previous trial), or, alternatively, that the expected response converges over successive trials to the actual experienced outcome. Without any loss of the generality, we can assume that the predicted outcome is equal to the last experienced outcome. Provided that the active pharmacological effect (x) is constant over successive drug administration trials, and that the higher cognitive information processing are avoided (in other words, $\gamma = 0$, see Eq.(2)), the reactive response due to implicit learning (i.e., due to the UCR, or y evaluation and revaluation over trials), i_R, is updated through the error-signal computation. In the first trial the reactive response is equal to zero, since no previous learning occured for the given drug administration (UCS); hence, $y_1 = x$. Since the expected outcome was equal to zero for that UCS, the error signal after the first administration trial is equal to x and, such a prediction error updates the reactive response, according

to Eq. (3). In the second open drug administration trial the response is given by Eq. (2) with $\gamma = 0$, that is $y_2 = x + \alpha x$; moreover, a new error signal is computed as $y_2 - y_1 = \alpha x$, and the reactive response updated at the end of the second trial is given by $i_{R2} = \alpha x + \alpha^2 x$. It easy to demonstrate (see Supplemental Information) that the response elicited in the n-th drug administration trials can be expressed as:

$$y_n = x + x \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\alpha^k \right). \tag{4}$$

Eq. (4) shows that the response to a given administration drug diverges (to infinity) or converges to an asymptotic value, as the number of trials increases, depending on the magnitude of α. The experimental observations (and the ordinary life experiences) show that the pharmacological responding tends to reach an asymptotic value over successive trials and does not diverge; hence the absolute value of α has to be comprises between zero and the unity (i.e., $0 < |\alpha| < 1$). We denote the above mathematical condition as *stability of the reactive system.* Under such a condition it is easy to demonstrate that the asymptotic response can be expressed as follows:

$$y_\infty = x + x \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha}, \tag{5}$$

where the active pharmacological effect (x) and the reactive component learned during successive trials (i.e., the quantity given by $i_{R\infty} = x \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$), are highlighted. At this stage, if in a successive trial an inerte substance is administered (in other words, if a placebo is given, so that the active pharmacological effect is brought to zero, $x = 0$), the placebo response coincides with the reactive response $i_{R\infty}$, implicitly learned over trials. We argue that such a reactive response represents the *unconscious* or *implicit placebo response*. If the placebo is administered during successive trials, it is easy to demonstrate that the response tends asymptotically to zero, driven by the error signal (see Supplemental Information). It is important pointing out that the open administration (UCS) allows the individual to perceive the UCS (i.e., the drug administration itself), and hence to trigger the learned reactive response associated with that UCS; furthermore, an error signal is computed whenever the UCS outcome is revaluated. Conversely, if the administration was hidden, no UCS can be perceived and no reactive response can be triggered. Moreover, it is arguably that different features of the drug administration (or substance intake), such as the flavor of a given pill (or even conditioned stimulus), contribute to perception and differentiation of the given substance intake (UCS).

Finally, the *integration,* the *reactive mimicking* and the *stability of the reactive system* properties lead to the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *It is necessary that two distinct quantities are encoded within the CNS for the stability of the reactive system, these are the reactive response and the predicted (expected) outcome.*

The demonstration is given on the Supplemental Information. In practice, the theorem proves that both the reactive response (i_R) and the expected (or predicted) outcome have to be computed and independently updated in order to assure the stability of the reactive system. In other words, the theorem proves that the reactive response cannot be represented by the predicted (i.e., expected) response.

Outcome Simulation and Conscious Placebo/Nocebo Response

Since the above mentioned theorem proves that both the reactive response and the expected outcome have to be coded within the CNS, the response to drug administration (more specifically the reactive component of it) should be a function of these quantities. In the previous Section it is shown how, in the absence of cognitive information processing, the reactive response by UCS revaluation learning through the computation of the error signal. In this Section it is proposed how it is possible modulating the reactive response through cognitive and conscious information processing, such as verbal suggestions, beliefs, expectations, and even by social observational learning [46]. More specifically, we hypothesize that cognitively processed information, which permits to infer (i.e., *to simulate*) the outcome of a given substance intake, lead to a process that we denoted *outcome simulation*. Such a process consists of high level cognitive processing of different pieces of information related to the outcome, and lead to the computation of the most probable outcome. Certainly such a computation depends also on the previous experiences which are evoked by the provided information. If the simulated outcome is different from the expected outcome (i.e., from the previously experienced outcome) an error signal is computed and the reactive response (i_R) is updated accordingly. From a mathematical and modeling perspective, the outcome simulation process corresponds to a *virtual* substance administration trial, in which the experienced outcome is the simulated (predicted or inferred through

cognitive processing) outcome, and the error signal is computed as the difference between the simulated and the expected. It easy to prove that the reactive response is updated by the error signal through the following recursive expression [12]:

$$i_{R,n} = i_{R,n-1} + \alpha \cdot e_n, \tag{6}$$

where e_n represents the error signal computed in the n-th trial (real or virtual), provided that α does not change over time; otherwise, the more general expression for i_R in the n-th trial is as follows:

$$i_{R,n} = \alpha_n \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} e_k. \tag{7}$$

For these reasons, verbal suggestions or beliefs which let a given individual inferring a positive (negative) outcome, lead to the computation of a positive (negative) error signal which increase (decrease) the reactive response associated with a given drug or treatment. We argue that the simulation process takes place not only in drug administration but even in more general situations, such as in stimulus-outcome learning (or UCS evaluation); for instance animals could learn that a given stimulus is dangerous observing others facing with such a stimulus [47]. Moreover, cognitive information processing could influence the reactive response associated with different stimuli and substances; for instance, in [48] is shown, by functional MRI studies, how prices of wine bottles (which represent here a piece of information related to the outcome) can affect the experienced pleasantness of the wine intaking (UCS). Indeed, the experienced pleasantness (which represents here the UCR) is due to the integration of the active component, x, and the reactive (self-induced) response i_R, which is due to prior learning and/or cognitive evaluation. Concluding, cognitive information processing could lead to an outcome simulation process which, in turn, modulates the reactive response through the computation of an error signal, uderstood as the difference between the simulated (inferred) outcome and the expected (previously experienced) outcome.

Operational Measures and Prediction of Implicit Placebo Response

Given a specific target neuronal population, the active response to a pharmacological administration (x) could vary across individuals, and, more important, the reactive response component (i.e., the implicit placebo or reactive response, i_R) could be even more variable. Indeed, the parameter α, which drives the reactive dynamics, should be a function of different parameters, such as the specific neural population involved (such as dopaminergic, opioidergic, serotonergic, and so on) and the number, the types and the sensitivity of the receptors within the given population. In turn, these variables depend on different parameters, for instance these are functions of the individual's genetic makeup. Indeed, there is growing evidence that the individual's genetic makeup (a stable trait) influences clinical outcomes and potentially may allow for identification of placebo responders (see [49] for a review). More specifically, treatment outcomes in the placebo arms of trials that have assessed genetic variation in the dopaminergic, opioid, cannabinoid, and serotonergic pathways suggest that genetic variation in the synthesis, signaling, and metabolism of these neurotransmitters contributes to variation in the placebo response [49]. For these reasons, it could be useful to estimate (i.e., measure) the quantities x and α for a given pharmacological target and for a specific genetic makeup. With such measures it should be possible to optimize the combination *drug-genetic makeup* and considering the implicit placebo response as a stable and reliable contribution of the pharmacological responding and, hence, as an indistinguishable part of the "true" *pharmacological treatment effect*. Operationally, the measure of the active pharmacological response can be assessed by hidden or covert drug administration. The response should be assessed quantitatively adopting, for instance, functional brain imaging or neurons activity recording, estimating the activity (understood as the product of the mean number of firing neuron and the mean firing rates) increase of the target neuronal population. Furthermore, the parameter α can be assessed by open (overt) drug administration, provided that the subject does not know which is the pharmacological target [3] (in other words the reactive response due to implicit UCS evaluation is considered, and the expectations, beliefs of clinical benefit or higher cognitive information processes are avoided; i.e. $\gamma = 0$, see Eq. (2)). More specifically, assessing the increase of the given neuronal population activity in successive drug administration trials permits to estimate the increase of the overall response (which comprises the active and the reactive response) which will converge to an asymptote, according to Eq. (5). Moreover, the asymptotic convergence to zero of the activity of the given neuronal population can be assessed over successive placebo administration trials. Hence, the parameter α could be reliably estimated from these data through simple mathematical computations.

Moreover, since an important prediction of the model is the dynamics of the error signals and of the reactive responses over successive open (active and placebo) administration trials, these quantities can be experimentally measured or estimated. In particular, experimental measures obtained recording dopamine neurons (e.g., see [39, 50, 10, 27, 34, 36]) reveal that

dopamine neurons in specific brain regions (such as the ventral tegmental area, VTA, or the substantia nigra) code prediction and prediction error signals related to rewards (in particular related to rewarding substances, drugs or food delivery). Despite these experiments were designed to study dopamine neurons activity in classical conditioning and in the unexpected (and predicted) delivery of rewarding susbstances, these suggest the possibility to monitor the activity of the VTA dopamine neurons (for instance in rats) during the administration of drugs which determine a rewarding response, such as cocaine or morphine. In particular, it is expected that in hidden drug administration trials no phasic activity of VTA dopamine neurons has to be observed; moreover, the same result should be observed during the first open drug administration trial. Furthemore, starting from the second administration trial, the coding of the reactive response associated with the drug administration (UCS) has to be observed, and such a response should increase asymptotically over successive trials. Finally, the VTA dopamine neurons activity should tend asymptotically to zero over successive placebo administration trials. From the above mentioned experimental measures it is possible to estimate the α parameter for the dopaminergic neuronal population related to a specific rewarding drug (indeed, different rewarding signals and neuronal populations exist, related to liquid or solid rewarding substances, drugs, and other rewarding stimuli; [10]). It is worth pointing out that the VTA neurons activity have to be monitored for all the duration of the drug effect within each trial, since it is arguably that the reactive response mimicks also the temporal trend of the active drug effect. In fact, in the above mentioned measures performed on the VTA neurons, time represents a fundamental variable which is coded by neurons (since, for instance, the time of the reward occurence plays and important role). In other words, it should be possible that, if the active drug effect starts after a time delay from the administration, and it vanishes with a specific temporal trend, the reactive response could mimick the same temporal trend.

Obtaining Increasing and Resistant-to-Extinction Reactive Responses

Since the mammalian brain is able to induce reactive responses similar to those obtained by pharmacological active effects, exploiting the implicit reactive system dynamics for obtaining a desired outcome should be feasible, in principle. More specifically, our system-level model suggests that it could be possible obtaining resistant-to-extinction reactive responses manipulating the error signal computation. Indeed, even avoiding and neglecting cognitive processing (e.g., verbal suggestions) during drug administration or substance intake, as previously shown, the error signal is implicitly computed, and it drives (or updates) the reactive response i_R associated with the representation of the given drug (i.e. the UCS; see also [12] for a more comprehensive analysis). Provided that, for a given genetic makeup and for a specific target CNS component, the reactive system efficiency α is greater than zero, after some active drug administration trials the reactive response reaches the asymptote $i_{R\infty} = x \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$ (see Eq. (5)) through implicit UCS revaluation learning, and, hence, through the successive updatings of the reactive response by error signal computations (see Eqs. (6-7)). Furthermore, if a placebo administration trial follows, then the implicit placebo response, which is equal to the asymptotic value $i_{R\infty}$, is experienced, moreover, the experienced outcome is updated and an error signal is computed, leading to a decrease of the reactive (placebo) response, which vanishes over successive placebo trials. However, if the error signal computation is blocked or "degraded" during placebo (or lower active dose) administration, the experienced outcome is updated; conversely the reactive response (and hence the implicit placebo response) does not decrease (or decrease by little), since no error signal (or a degraded error signal) updated it. Furthermore, a resistant-to-extinction reactive response can be obtained, since no error signals can be computed over successive trials, because the expected outcome concides with the reactive response, which, in turn, coincides with the experienced outcome; in other words, a reactive response which does not tend asymptotically to zero over successive placebo trials is obtained. We denote such a response i_{R0}, since it will be elicitated by the reactive system at every substance intake trial (as it were originally generated by a fictitious trial *zero*), regardless of whether an active pharmacological effect exists. Indeed, it is easy to demonstrate that, if a resistant-to-extinction reactive response i_{R0} has been associated to a given substance, the expression for the response to substance intake driven through implicit learning in the generic n-th trial is[2]:

$$y_n = i_{R0} + x + \alpha\,(y_{n-1} - i_{R0})\,. \tag{8}$$

The resistant-to-extinction property of a reactive response is the key element for increasing unlimitedly an implicit response; indeed, repeating the cycle of trials (i.e., the above described protocol) adopted for obtaining i_{R0}, will lead to the increase of the reactive response, through an accumulation principle (see Supplemental Information for the computational details). Hence, through multiple cycles of active pharmacological drug administration followed by inerte (or a lower active dose) substance administration, together with a pharmacological treatment able to degrade the error signal computation (more

[2]In [12] it is shown that different resistant-to-extinction emotional reactive responses are natively coded in the mammalian brain from birth, and these are associated with phylogenetic (i.e., prepared biological and evolutionary fear relevant) stimuli representations [51, 52].

specifically able to lower the precisions associated with error signals, see [44, 43]), it is possible to "force" the CNS to react to such a drug with an increasing self-induced response which mimics the active pharmacological treatment. After some cycles it is expected that the reactive response i_R will be greater than the original active pharmacological response, and the pharmacological effect can be increased indefinitely.

In practice, it is expected that the error signal cannot be completely eliminated in the placebo administration trials, so that multiple placebo administration trials with an "error signal degradation treatment" will be required, and the resulting i_{R0} will be smaller than $i_{R\infty}$. Nevertheless, the proposed implicit learning model describes the reactive system dynamics at a system (macro) level and, even if it predicts the possibility of obtaining a resistant-to-extinction (i.e., stable) and increasing reactive response, it does not give any indications of how obtaining it, nor which pharmacological targets have to be considered for the degradation of the error signal. For these reasons, a specific model, which can describe the error signal computation at a deeper level (i.e., at the neurons level) is required. We argue such a model could be represented by the so called *predictive coding* model (and its version applied to action learning; *active inference*) [42, 43, 44, 45].

Predictive Coding, Active Inference and Error Signal Computation

In predictive coding [42, 43] is formalized the notion of the Bayesian brain, in which neural representations in the higher levels of cortical hierarchies generate predictions of representations in lower levels. These *top-down* predictions are compared with representations at the lower level to compute a *prediction error*. The resulting error-signal is passed back up the hierarchy to update higher representations; this recursive exchange of signals lead to the minimization (ideally the suppression) of the prediction error at each and every level to provide a hierarchical explanation for sensory inputs that enter at the lowest (sensory) level. In the Bayesian jargon neuronal activity encodes beliefs or probability distributions over states in the world that causes sensations [43]. In predictive coding the notion of *precision* (or confidence, which represents the inverse of the variance) of the error signals is also formalised, and the mechanism through which the brain has to estimate and encode the precision associated with the prediction errors is explained. The prediction errors are then weighted with their precision before being assimilated at a high hierarchical level. More specifically, active inference accounts posit that the brain deals with *noisy* prediction errors by decreasing the gain on cortical pyramidal neurons that function like precision units to regulate outputs from signal error computations, thereby reducing the influence of these outputs [53, 42, 54]. It is important pointing out that the resulting error signal depends on the relative precision of prediction errors at each level of the neural hierarchy. Hence, a neuropharmacological alteration of the precision on different levels in the cortical hierarchy could lead to the modulation of the error signal computation. Furthermore, it is supposed [55, 56] that such an alteration may naturally occur in some pathologies, such as in Parkinson's desease, where the depletion of dopamine (which is supposed to encode the precision of prediction errors by altering their synaptic gain, as also other neurotransmitters do [56]) at different levels, would alter the balance of precision at higher (sensorimotor) relative to lower (primary sensory) levels in the cortical hierarchy; moreover, the symptoms vary according to the site (hierarchical level) of changes in precision [55].

Neuronal Populations within the Reactive System

Which are the neuronal populations belonging to the reactive system? In other words, for which CNS response components does the reactive mimicking property hold? If a given neuronal population belongs to the reactive system, then it is possible to obtain a reactive response (i.e., an implicit placebo response) for this neuronal population. Experimental results from the literature evidence that at least the following CNS components could generate a reactive response: 1) emotional system responses [12] (which include, for instance, the dopaminergic mesolimbic and mesocortical system, [57, 58], the endocannabinoid and opioid system in placebo analgesia, [21, 23, 59, 24, 60, 61, 62], the serotoninergic system, the target neuronal systems of depression, anxiety and addiction; see [1]); 2) the dopaminergic motor system [19, 20]; 3) the *humoral immune response system* (in particular the components of the CNS such as the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, HPA, or the sympathetic nervous system, SNS; [1, 63, 64, 65]); 4) the endocrine system; (see [1, 66] for a review). We speculate that the main components of the reactive system are the emotional/motivational and the humoral immune systems, since, from an evolutionary perspective, the organism has to be able to learn and to automatically react whenever "important" stimuli are perceived, and, implicitly recognize "relevant" substances, such as food, in order to approach or avoid them or to quickly and automatically react (for instance through an automatic trigger of a first immune response). More specifically, a stimulus is "important or relevant" for an organism if it previously elicited a CNS response belonging to the reactive system, such as a painful stimuli (which are related to emotional components), a rewarding substance (such as food), or primary immune responses.

Discussion

We propose a model describing response to substance intake based on implicit UCS revauation learning (which describes the automatic evaluation and revaluation of an unconditioned stimulus, that represents the given substance intake). Such a model formalizes the key properties of drug administration response based on well established empirical evidence. The theoretical conceptualization leads to a theorem which proves the necessity of the encoding of two fundamental quantities: the reactive response and the expected (or predicted) outcome. We have derived a model that meets this requirement and is able to predict the response to drug administration over successive trials. The placebo response is mathematically formalized as a reactive response, which represents an implicit and inevitable component of the overall response to substance intake; moreover its effect becomes naturally evident when an organism responds to a substance administration whose active (pharmacological) effect has been eliminated.

Modeling the dynamics of the reactive system, from which the placebo response originates, permits also the definition of quantities (e.g., the reactive efficiency, α) and of operational measures which could lead to the maximization and the stabilization of the reactive response (i_R) for a given genetic makeup, even when the pharmacological active effect (x) is kept constant. Furthermore, the model shows that it should be possible to create a resistant-to-extinction reactive response blocking (or degrading) the error signal computation in specific trials. More specifically, after some trials in which the active drug is administered in order to increase the implicit reactive response, successive trials have to follow, in which placebo administration is given together with a pharmacological treatment able to degrade the precisions of the error signal (and hence the overall error signal computation). The targets of such a pharmacological treatment have to be specific neurotransmitters on precise level of the neural hierarchy, depending on the target component of the original active drug administration; moreover, predictive coding and active inference model provides the theoretical and computational basis for the assessment of such targets.

In this manuscript, the theoretical feasibility study of a strategy for the unlimited increase of a given drug effectiveness has been developed. Further computational and experimental studies are needed in order to explore the mentioned strategy.

We also argue that the generality of our model permits the modeling of a broad range of phenomena and pathologies which involve the interaction between an organism and a substance intake, such as, drug addictions and eating disorders, and for the development of novel strategies for decreasing pathological resistant-to-extinction reactive responses, such as in phobias or post-traumatic stress disorders.

Supplemental Information

In the following sections the equations describing the reactive system dynamics (and, hence, the implicit placebo response dynamics) are derived. It is assumed that no cognitive information processes occur (in other words, verbal suggestions, beliefs and expectations on clinical benefit are avoided); however, drug administration, or substance intake, has to be "overt", so that the considered individual is aware that the same substance is administered over successive trials (but he/she does not know which is the pharmacological target of such a substance). Furthermore, to ease the computations, it is assumed that the expected (predicted) response, in a given k-th trial, coincides with the last experienced outcome (i.e., $y_{expected,k} = y_{k-1}$).

Implicit Response Acquisition to a Substance Intake

In this section the responses elicited during succesive trials in which an active drug is administered are derived.

In Table 1 the variables of interest are mathematically described through succesive trials. A single CNS component (i.e., a specific target neural population) is considered for the computations, provided that such a component belongs also to the *reactive system*.

Trial number	Active pharmacological response (x_k)	Reactive response $(\mathrm{i_{R,k}} = \mathrm{i_{R,k-1}} + \alpha \cdot \mathrm{e_{k-1}})$	CNS response $(y_k = x_k + i_{R,k})$	Error signal $(\mathrm{e_k} = \mathrm{y_k} - \mathrm{y_{k-1}})$
0	$x_0 = 0$	$i_{R0} = 0$	$y_0 = 0$	$e_0 = 0$
1	$x_1 = x$	$i_{R,1} = 0$	$y_1 = x$	$e_1 = x$
2	$x_2 = x$	$i_{R,2} = \alpha \cdot x$	$y_2 = x + \alpha \cdot x$	$e_2 = \alpha \cdot x$
3	$x_3 = x$	$i_{R,3} = \alpha \cdot x + \alpha^2 \cdot x$	$y_3 = x + \alpha \cdot x + \alpha^2 \cdot x$	$e_3 = \alpha^2 \cdot x$
...	...	...	...	...
n	$x_n = x$	$i_{R,n} = \alpha x + \alpha^2 x + ... + \alpha^{n-1} x$	$y_n = x + \alpha x + \alpha^2 x + ... + \alpha^{n-1} x$	$e_n = \alpha^{n-1} \cdot x$

Table 1. **In this Table the computations leading to the automatic central nervous system (CNS) response to a drug intake over successive trials are derived. It is assumed that the active pharmacological effect (x) is constant over successive trials.**

The response to drug intake in the n-th trial can be written as:

$$y_n = x + x \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\alpha^k \right) \tag{9}$$

Considering the reactive system stability property, it follows that the term α has to be less than one in magnitude (i.e. $0 < |\alpha| < 1$). Hence the summation term in eq. (9) converges to the value $\alpha/(1-\alpha)$, for the property of the geometric series, when the number of trials tends to infinity. Thus, the asymptotic response due to the active drug administration can be written as:

$$y_\infty = \frac{x}{1-\alpha} = x + \frac{\alpha \cdot x}{1-\alpha}. \tag{10}$$

The eq. (9) can also be expressed as:

$$y_n = x + \alpha \cdot y_{n-1} \tag{11}$$

which shows the recursive nature of the response acquisition process over successive trials.

Reactive or Implicit Placebo Response Dynamics

In this section the response elicited during succesive trials where a placebo is administered (i.e. the active pharmacological component is absent) is derived.

In Table 2 the variables of interest are mathematically described over succesive trials. A single generic component is considered in the computations, moreover, it is assumed that the asymptotic response has been reached over the previous active drug administration trials (see Eq.(5)).

Trial number	Active pharmacological response (x_k)	Reactive response $(\mathrm{i_{R,k}} = \mathrm{i_{R,k-1}} + \alpha \cdot \mathrm{e_{k-1}})$	CNS response $(y_k = x_k + i_{R,k})$	Error signal $(\mathrm{e_k} = \mathrm{y_k} - \mathrm{y_{k-1}})$
0	$x_0 = x$	$i_{R0} = x \cdot \alpha/(1-\alpha)$	$y_0 = x/(1-\alpha)$	$e_0 = 0$
1	$x_1 = 0$	$i_{R,1} = x \cdot \alpha/(1-\alpha)$	$y_1 = x \cdot \alpha/(1-\alpha)$	$e_1 = -x$
2	$x_2 = 0$	$i_{R,2} = x \cdot \alpha/(1-\alpha) - \alpha \cdot x$	$y_2 = x \cdot \alpha^2/(1-\alpha)$	$e_2 = -\alpha \cdot x$
3	$x_3 = 0$	$i_{R,3} = x \cdot \alpha^2/(1-\alpha) - \alpha^2 \cdot x$	$y_3 = x \cdot \alpha^3/(1-\alpha)$	$e_3 = -\alpha^2 \cdot x$
...	...	...	...	...
n	$x_n = 0$	$i_{R,n} = x \cdot \alpha^{n-1}/(1-\alpha) - \alpha^{n-1} \cdot x$	$y_n = x \cdot \alpha^n/(1-\alpha)$	$e_n = -\alpha^{n-1} \cdot x$

Table 2. **- In this Table the computations leading to the reactive (implicit placebo) response extinction over successive trials are derived. It is assumed that, previously to placebo admnistration trials, the pharmacological effect was equal to x.**

The response to placebo administration in the n-th trial can be written as:

$$\begin{cases} y_n = \alpha \cdot y_{n-1} \\ y_0 = Y_0 \end{cases}, \tag{12}$$

where, provided that the asymptote had been reached during the previous active pharmacological trials, $Y_0 = x \cdot \alpha/(1-\alpha)$.

Theorem*: It is necessary that two distinct quantities are encoded within the CNS for the stability of the reactive system, these are the reactive response and the predicted* (*expected*) *outcome.*

Proof. ***Proof by contradiction (reductio ad absurdum)***

□

Hypothesis 1: The reactive response associated with a given substance intake coincides with the expected (predicted) outcome, and the expected or predicted outcome converges to the experienced outcome.

Hypotheses 2: The properties integration, reactive mimiking and reactive system stability hold.

Hypotheses 3: Cognitive information processing are avoided (in other words, no beliefs, expectations for clinical benefits, verbal suggestions and so on, are involved).

Hypothesis 1 asserts that a unique reactive signal predicting the drug administration outcome exists, and that this signal coincides with the reactive response elicited when the drug is administered; furthermore, the predicting signal converges (by learning) to the actual experienced elicitation. The last assumption has been formulated to include a more general scenario than that considered in our initial assumptions, in which the expected outcome coincides with the last experienced outcome. From a mathematical viewpoint, the expected outcome can be computed using any supervised learning method (or, alternatively, TD methods [40]) in which the predicted outcome is evaluated on the basis of the past m predictions (i.e., of the predicted outcomes in the last m trials) and of the actual outcome, minimizing the error between the prediction and the experienced outcome. Otherwise it can be assumed that the predicted outcome coincides with the last experienced outcome.

1. Let the UCS be the drug administration.
2. Drug administration to a given subject takes place on successive trials, so that it exerts an active elicitation (i.e., it elicits the active response x). During the first trial the response is exclusively due to the active pharmacological component, that is $y_1 = x$. After the first trial (for instance, during the drug administration in the second trial), the predicted (reactive) response, called $y_{predicted,1}$, is computed.
3. In the second trial, after the drug administration, the predicted outcome ($y_{predicted,1}$) adds up to the successive UCS active elicitation, so that the outcome can be expressed as $y_2 = y_{expected,1} + x$. Furthermore, since $y_{predicted,1}$ does not coincide with the actual experienced outcome, the new prediction $y_{predicted,2}$ is computed after the second trial; it can be easily proved that $y_{predicted,2} > y_{predicted,1}$ (since the experienced outcome has been strengthened and the error signal has to be minimized).
4. In the third trial the experienced outcome can be written as $y_3 = y_{predicted,2} + x$; since $y_3 > y_2 \geq y_{predicted,2}$ a new value for the predicted response is computed, called $y_{predicted,3}$, such that $y_{predicted,3} > y_{predicted,2}$.
5. In the n-th trial the outcome can be expressed as $y_n = y_{predicted,n-1} + x$; it is easy to prove that $y_n > y_{n-1} \geq y_{predicted,n-1}$. Moreover, if the number of trials tends to infinity, the outcome grows indefinitely (i.e., $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = \infty$).
6. The last statement is absurd, as it contradicts Hypothesis 2, in particular it contradicts the stability system principle.

Increasing a Reactive Response through Resistant-To-Extinction Increments

Provided that a resistant-to-extinction reactive response, denoted i_{R0}, has been previously obtained (see Section "Obtaining Increasing and Resistant-to-Extinction Reactive Response"), it is easy to show that the drug intake response is expressed as:

$$y_n = i_{R0} + x + \alpha\,(y_{n-1} - i_{R0})\,, \tag{13}$$

where the term i_{R0} represents the inextinguishable reactive response obtained during the first protocol cycle. The generic response at the n-th trial can also be expressed as:

$$y_n = i_{R0} + x + x\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \alpha^k. \tag{14}$$

Eqs. (13-14) can be obtained from the computations shown in Tab. 3.

Trial number	Active pharmacological response (x_k)	Reactive response $(\mathrm{i_{R,k}} = \mathrm{i_{R,k-1}} + \alpha \cdot \mathrm{e_{k-1}})$	CNS response $(y_k = x_k + i_{R,k})$	Error signal $(\mathrm{e_k} = \mathrm{y_k} - \mathrm{y_{k-1}})$
0	$x_0 = 0$	$i_{R,0} = i_{R0}$	$y_0 = i_{R0}$	$e_0 = 0$
1	$x_1 = x$	$i_{R,1} = i_{R0}$	$y_1 = x + i_{R0}$	$e_1 = x$
2	$x_2 = x$	$i_{R,2} = i_{R0} + \alpha \cdot x$	$y_2 = x + \alpha \cdot x + i_{R0}$	$e_2 = \alpha \cdot x$
3	$x_3 = x$	$i_{R,3} = i_{R0} + \alpha \cdot x + \alpha^2 \cdot x$	$y_3 = x + \alpha \cdot x + \alpha^2 x + i_{R0}$	$e_3 = \alpha^2 \cdot x$
...	...	...	...	...
n	$x_n = x$	$i_{R,n} = i_{R0} + \alpha x + \alpha^2 x + ... + \alpha^{n-1} x$	$y_n = x + \alpha x + \alpha^2 x + ... + \alpha^{n-1} x + i_{R0}$	$e_n = \alpha^{n-1} \cdot x$

Table 3. **- In this Table the computations leading to the automatic central nervous system (CNS) response to a drug intake over successive trials are derived. It is assumed that the active pharmacological effect is constant and equal to x, furthermore, a resistant-to-extinction reactive response (i_{R0}) associated to the given substance intake has been previously obtained, through the strategy described in the previous sections.**

References

References

[1] Benedetti F. Mechanisms of placebo and placebo-related effects across diseases and treatments. Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology. 2008;48:33–60.

[2] Colloca L, Lopiano L, Lanotte M, Benedetti F. Overt versus covert treatment for pain, anxiety, and Parkinson's disease. Lancet Neurology. 2004;3(11):679–684.

[3] Amanzio M, Benedetti F. Neuropharmacological Dissection of Placebo Analgesia: Expectation-Activated Opioid Systems versus Conditioning-Activated Specific Subsystems. Journal of Neuroscience. 1999;19(1):484–94.

[4] Bingel U, Colloca L, Vase L. Mechanisms and clinical implications of the placebo effect: is there a potential for the elderly? A mini-review. Gerontology. 2011;57(4):354–363.

[5] Benedetti F, Carlino E, Pollo A. Hidden administration of drugs. Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2011;90(5):651–661.

[6] Bowman EM, Aigner TG, Richmond BJ. Neural signals in the monkey ventral striatum related to motivation for juice and cocaine rewards. Journal of Neurophysiology. 1996;75(3):1061–1073.

[7] Carelli RM, Deadwyler SA. A comparison of nucleus accumbens neuronal firing patterns during cocaine self-administration and water reinforcement in rats. Journal of Neuroscience. 1994;14(12):7735–7746.

[8] Chang JY, Janak PH, Woodward DJ. Comparison of mesocorticolimbic neuronal responses during cocaine and heroin self-administration in freely moving rats. Journal of Neuroscience. 1998;18(8):3098–3115.

[9] Carelli RM, Ijames SG, Crumling AJ. Evidence that separate neural circuits in the nucleus accumbens encode cocaine versus "natural" (water and food) reward. Journal of Neuroscience. 2000;20(11):4255–4266.

[10] Schultz W. Multiple reward signals in the brain. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2000;1(3):199–207.

[11] Hosoba T, Iwanaga M, Seiwa H. The effect of UCS inflation and deflation procedures on 'fear' conditioning. Behaviour Research and Therapy. 2001;39(4):465–475.

[12] Puviani L, Rama S, Vitetta G. Prediction Errors Drive UCS Revaluation and not Classical Conditioning: Evidence and Neurophysiological Consequences. arXiv:160107766. 2016;.

[13] Rescorla RA. Effect of inflation of the unconditioned stimulus value following conditioning. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology. 1974;86(1):101–106.

[14] Pavlov IP. Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex. Oxford University Press. 1927;.

[15] Ito R, Dalley JW, Howes SR, Robbins TW, Everitt BJ. Dissociation in conditioned dopamine release in the nucleus accumbens core and shell in response to cocaine cues and during cocaine-seeking behavior in rats. Journal of Neuroscience. 2000;20(19):7489–7495.

[16] Schultz DH, Balderston NL, Geiger JA, Helmstetter FJ. Dissociation between implicit and explicit responses in post-conditioning UCS revaluation after fear conditioning in humans. Behavioral Neuroscience. 2013;127(3):357–368.

[17] Brunton LL, Lazo JS, Parker KL. Goodman & Gilman's The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics. 11th ed. McGraw-Hill; 2006.

[18] Guo JY, Wang JY, Luo F. Dissection of placebo analgesia in mice: the conditions for activation of opioid and non-opioid systems. J Psychopharmacol (Oxford). 2010;24(10):1561–1567.

[19] De la Fuente-Fernandez R, Ruth TJ, Sossi V, Schulzer M, Calne DB, Stoessl AJ. Expectation and dopamine release: mechanism of the placebo effect in Parkinson's disease. Science. 2001;293(5532):1164–1166.

[20] De la Fuente-Fernandez R, Stoessl AJ. The placebo effect in Parkinson's disease. Trends in Neurosciences. 2002;25(6):302–6.

[21] Eippert F, Bingel U, Schoell ED, Yacubian J, Klinger R, Lorenz J, et al. Activation of the opioidergic descending pain control system underlies placebo analgesia. Neuron. 2009;63(4):533–543.

[22] Lui F, Colloca L, Duzzi D, Anchisi D, Benedetti F, Porro CA. Neural bases of conditioned placebo analgesia. Pain. 2010;151(3):816–824.

[23] Nolan TA, Price DD, Caudle RM, Murphy NP, Neubert JK. Placebo-induced analgesia in an operant pain model in rats. Pain. 2012;153(10):2009–2016.

[24] Petrovic P, Kalso E, Petersson KM, Ingvar M. Placebo and opioid analgesia– imaging a shared neuronal network. Science. 2002;295(5560):1737–1740.

[25] Haour F. Mechanisms of the placebo effect and of conditioning. Neuroimmunomodulation. 2005;12(4):195–200.

[26] Garrison J, Erdeniz B, Done J. Prediction error in reinforcement learning: a meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews. 2013;37(7):1297–1310.

[27] Schultz W, Dickinson A. Neuronal coding of prediction errors. Annual Review of Neuroscience. 2000;23(1):473–500.

[28] Berns GS, McClure SM, Pagnoni G, Montague PR. Predictability modulates human brain response to reward. Journal of Neuroscience. 2001;21(8):2793–2798.

[29] O'Doherty JP, Dayan P, Friston K, Critchley H, Dolan RJ. Temporal difference models and reward-related learning in the human brain. Neuron. 2003;38(2):329–337.

[30] Bray S, O'Doherty J. Neural coding of reward-prediction error signals during classical conditioning with attractive faces. Journal of Neurophysiology. 2007;97(4):3036–3045.

[31] Delgado MR, Li J, Schiller D, Phelps EA. The role of the striatum in aversive learning and aversive prediction errors. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences. 2008;363(1511):3787–3800.

[32] Li SS, McNally GP. The conditions that promote fear learning: prediction error and Pavlovian fear conditioning. Neurobiology of Learning and Memory. 2014;108:14–21.

[33] McNally GP, Johansen JP, Blair HT. Placing prediction into the fear circuit. Trends in Neurosciences. 2011;34(6):283–292.

[34] Schultz W. Behavioral theories and the neurophysiology of reward. Annual Review of Psychology. 2006;57:87–115.

[35] Steinberg EE, Keiflin R, Boivin JR, Witten IB, Deisseroth K, Janak PH. A causal link between prediction errors, dopamine neurons and learning. Nature Neuroscience. 2013;16(7):966–973.

[36] Waelti P, Dickinson A, Schultz W. Dopamine responses comply with basic assumptions of formal learning theory. Nature. 2001;412(6842):43–48.

[37] Miller RR, Barnet RC, Grahame NJ. Assessment of the Rescorla-Wagner model. Psychological Bulletin. 1995;117(3):363–386.

[38] Rescorla RA, Wagener AR. 3. In: Black AH, Prokasy WF, editors. A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: Variations in the effectiveness of reinforcement and nonreinforcement. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York; 1972. p. 64–99.

[39] Schultz W, Dayan P, Montague PR. A neural substrate of prediction and reward. Science. 1997;275(5306):1593–1599.

[40] Sutton RS. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. Machine Learning. 1988;p. 3, 9–44.

[41] Sutton RS, Barto AG. Time-derivative models of pavlovian reinforcement. In: Gabriel M, J Moore E, editors. Learning and Computational Neuroscience: Foundations of Adaptive Networks. MIT Press.; 1990. p. 59, 229–243. 497–537.

[42] Friston K. Learning and inference in the brain. Neural Networks. 2003;16(9):1325–1352.

[43] Friston K. Hierarchical models in the brain. PLoS Computational Biology. 2008;4(11):e1000211.

[44] Friston KJ, Daunizeau J, Kiebel SJ. Reinforcement learning or active inference? PLoS ONE. 2009;4(7):e6421.

[45] Friston KJ, Daunizeau J, Kilner J, Kiebel SJ. Action and behavior: a free-energy formulation. Biological Cybernetics. 2010;102(3):227–260.

[46] Colloca L, Benedetti F. Placebo analgesia induced by social observational learning. Pain. 2009;144(1-2):28–34.

[47] Olsson A, Nearing KI, Phelps EA. Learning fears by observing others: the neural systems of social fear transmission. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience. 2007;2(1):3–11.

[48] Plassmann H, O'Doherty J, Shiv B, Rangel A. Marketing actions can modulate neural representations of experienced pleasantness. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2008;105(3):1050–1054.

[49] Hall KT, Loscalzo J, Kaptchuk TJ. Genetics and the placebo effect: the placebome. Trends in Molecular Medicine. 2015;21(5):285–294.

[50] Schultz W. Predictive reward signal of dopamine neurons. Journal of Neurophysiology. 1998;p. 80: 1–27.

[51] Esteves F, Parra C, Dimberg U, Ohman A. Nonconscious associative learning: Pavlovian conditioning of skin conductance responses to masked fear-relevant facial stimuli. Psychophysiology. 1994;p. 31:375–385.

[52] Ohman A, Soares JJ. On the automatic nature of phobic fear: conditioned electrodermal responses to masked fear-relevant stimuli. Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1993;102(1):121–132.

[53] Barrett LF, Simmons WK. Interoceptive predictions in the brain. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2015;16(7):419–429.

[54] Pezzulo G, Rigoli F, Friston K. Active Inference, homeostatic regulation and adaptive behavioural control. Progress in Neurobiology. 2015;134:17–35.

[55] Adams RA, Shipp S, Friston KJ. Predictions not commands: active inference in the motor system. Brain Structure and Function. 2013;218(3):611–643.

[56] Feldman H, Friston KJ. Attention, uncertainty, and free-energy. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience. 2010;4:215.

[57] Scott DJ, Stohler CS, Egnatuk CM, Wang H, Koeppe RA, Zubieta JK. Individual differences in reward responding explain placebo-induced expectations and effects. Neuron. 2007;55(2):325–336.

[58] Colloca L. Emotional modulation of placebo analgesia. Pain. 2014;155(4):651.

[59] De Pascalis V, Chiaradia C, Carotenuto E. The contribution of suggestibility and expectation to placebo analgesia phenomenon in an experimental setting. Pain. 2002;96(3):393–402.

[60] Wager TD, Scott DJ, Zubieta JK. Placebo effects on human mu-opioid activity during pain. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2007;104(26):11056–11061.

[61] Watson A, El-Deredy W, Iannetti GD, Lloyd D, Tracey I, Vogt BA, et al. Placebo conditioning and placebo analgesia modulate a common brain network during pain anticipation and perception. Pain. 2009;145(1-2):24–30.

[62] Zubieta JK, Bueller JA, Jackson LR, Scott DJ, Xu Y, Koeppe RA, et al. Placebo effects mediated by endogenous opioid activity on mu-opioid receptors. Journal of Neuroscience. 2005;25(34):7754–7762.

[63] Cacioppo JT, Tassinary LG, Berntson G. Handbook of psychophysiology. Cambridge University Press; 2007.

[64] Goebel MU, Trebst AE, Steiner J, Xie YF, Exton MS, Frede S, et al. Behavioral conditioning of immunosuppression is possible in humans. FASEB Journal. 2002;16(14):1869–1873.

[65] Vits S, Cesko E, Enck P, Hillen U, Schadendorf D, Schedlowski M. Behavioural conditioning as the mediator of placebo responses in the immune system. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences. 2011;366(1572):1799–1807.

[66] Enck P, Benedetti F, Schedlowski M. New insights into the placebo and nocebo responses. Neuron. 2008;59(2):195–206.